

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

NORTH CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT
45 FREMONT, SUITE 2000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219
VOICE AND TDD (415) 904-5260
FAX (415) 904-5400



F 7a

Filed: April 6, 1999
49th Day: May 20, 1999 (waived)
Staff: JL/CLK – SF
Staff Report: April 27, 2000
Hearing Date: May 12, 2000

DE NOVO REVIEW: PACIFIC RIDGE DEVELOPMENT ISSUES SUMMARY REPORT

APPEAL NO.:	A-1-HMB-99-022
APPLICANTS:	Ailanto Properties
AGENT:	Robert Henry
LOCAL GOVERNMENT:	City of Half Moon Bay
SUBSTANTIAL ISSUE:	The Commission found Substantial Issue for the appeal on March 17, 2000.
PROJECT LOCATION:	Adjacent to the eastern ends of Grandview Boulevard and Terrace Avenue, north of Highway 92 and east of Highway 1 in the City of Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	The proposed development includes subdivision of 114 acres into 145 lots, construction of a detached single-family home on each lot, streets, open space parcels and neighborhood park areas.
APPELLANTS:	Commissioner Sara Wan Commissioner Mike Reilly Eleanor Wittrup and George Carman
SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS:	See Appendix A

1.0 STAFF NOTE

1.1 Overview

On March 17, 2000 the Commission found that the appeals submitted regarding this proposed project raise a substantial issue with respect to the grounds on which they were filed. This staff report represents the next step in the Commission's review process of the proposed development project. This report contains a description of the project as currently proposed by Ailanto Properties and a preliminary analysis of issues raised by the project under the Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program.

Section 13057(d) of the Commission's regulations states that where the Executive Director of the Commission determines that public comment and Commission discussion would facilitate preparation of a final staff recommendation, the Executive Director may elect to first prepare a partial staff report that does not contain a recommendation on whether the Commission should grant the application, with or without conditions, or deny the application. Consistent with the regulations, staff recommends that the Commission open the public hearing on May 13, 2000 and accept public testimony from the applicant and persons supporting and opposing the proposed project. Following such testimony, the Commission may wish to engage in discussion of the project and/or the issues. The staff recommends that the Commission then continue the public hearing to a subsequent Commission meeting, prior to which staff will publish a written recommendation for action by the Commission.

1.2 Proposed developments in the San Mateo County/Half Moon Bay coastal area raise significant issues.

The issues presented by this proposed development are unusually complex, due to the relatively large scale of the project, limits on urban services in the Half Moon Bay area, the complexity of Half Moon Bay's LCP, and the fact that the rapidly urbanizing San Mateo County mid-coast area falls partly under Half Moon Bay's jurisdiction and partly under the County of San Mateo's jurisdiction. Such circumstances are hardly unique, of course, within California's coastal zone. However, within the past year or two, the pace of development, both actual and proposed, has been particularly rapid on the San Mateo County coast, including within the City of Half Moon Bay. A very strong real estate market in the San Francisco Bay Area as a whole and San Mateo County in particular, coupled with the recent expansion of the Sewer Authority Mid Coastside sewage treatment plant, which serves the urbanized portions of the San Mateo County coast, and the availability of additional water supplies have contributed to making the subject area one of intense development pressure.

Within the past year, for instance, the following projects have been appealed to the Commission from the San Mateo County area, raising (among others) potential issues of urban service capacity, protection of environmentally sensitive habitat areas and visual resources, and provision of adequate public access to the shoreline:

- #A-1-99-20, Coastside County Water District (Half Moon Bay): replacement of 2,200 feet of a 10-inch-diameter water supply main line with a 16-inch diameter line; Commission found substantial issue on June 7, 1999; final action pending.

A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development) De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report

- #A-2-99-63, Coastside County Water District (San Mateo County): replacement of an additional segment of the above-mentioned water line within San Mateo County's jurisdiction; Commission found substantial issue on February 18, 2000; final action pending.
- #A-1-99-51, Wavecrest Village (Half Moon Bay); mixed-use project consisting of 225 market rate and 46 affordable apartments on 75.8 acres, commercial uses on 16.8 acres, community facilities such as ball fields and community gardens, a new middle school for the Cabrillo Unified School District, and a Boys and Girls Club; Commission found substantial issue on November 5, 1999; final action pending.
- #A-2-99-066, Field and Lee (San Mateo County): 6,500-square foot single-family residence near Año Nuevo State Reserve; Commission action postponed by applicant; final action pending.

Of course, projects and issues from other parts of the North Central Coast District continue to come before the Commission, including the revision of Sonoma County's Local Coastal Program that was submitted in August 1999 and other Local Coastal Program submittals, permit applications, and appeals from San Francisco, Marin, and Sonoma Counties. Nevertheless, the San Mateo County coast currently generates the largest share of the District office's workload.

Because of a high level of local interest in this project and because the May Commission meeting will be held in Northern California, closer to the project site than most Commission meetings, staff has scheduled a hearing on the proposed project for this meeting. Staff has prepared the following summary of the project and certain key issues that are likely to be the focus of public comment and Commission discussion.

1.3 Since the appeal was filed, the proposed project has been revised

Staff notes that since the project was initially approved by Half Moon Bay and appealed to the Commission, the applicant has made significant changes in the project. For instance, as approved by the City of Half Moon Bay, the project included 197 residential parcels. On October 28, 1999 the applicant revised the proposed plan to include 151 parcels containing 150 homes. A subsequent revision by the applicant on January 24, 2000 has brought the number of proposed homes to 145.

Aside from revisions to the project, the applicant has provided materials on a number of occasions that have clarified the nature of the proposed project. For instance, letters of April 4 and April 6 from the applicant have addressed the 88 conditions adopted by Half Moon Bay when the City approved the previous version of the project on March 16, 1999, indicating which of the conditions have been incorporated by the applicant into the project description and which ones have been superseded by subsequent alterations in the project. Revisions to the project and the clarifications provided by the applicant have assisted Commission staff in analyzing the conformity of the project with the policies of the Local Coastal Program. In some issue areas, such as the relationship of the project to environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHAs) on the project site, project revisions have substantially reduced or potentially eliminated conflicts between project components and LCP policies requiring protection of such resources.

On the other hand, the cumulative impact of the proposed project, in conjunction with that of other potential developments in the San Mateo County coast area, on levels of service on area

**A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development)
De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report**

highways remains a significant issue, in spite of project revisions. A very limited number of area highways are shared by visitors to the coast and coastal residents, including the future residents of this proposed subdivision, and the ability of area highways to serve this and other developments contemplated by the Half Moon Bay LCP and the San Mateo County LCP remains a fundamental question.

Because the proposed project is substantially different than the one that was approved by Half Moon Bay in March 1999 and analyzed in the Commission's findings regarding Substantial Issue, dated March 17, 2000, the appellants' statements of the reasons for the appeal, the applicant's preliminary responses to the appeal, and certain correspondence may address project elements that have been substantially changed or are no longer part of the revised proposed project. All of this correspondence is part of the project record, and much of it was attached as exhibits to the findings of substantial issue. For the sake of brevity, clarity, and to avoid waste, most of this superseded material is not again reproduced in this report. Instead, a package containing select items of correspondence is being provided in a separate package along with this report. However, staff has carefully reviewed that material to assure that the issues and concerns that apply to the proposed project, as revised, are addressed in this staff report.

2.0 PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The entire City of Half Moon Bay is within the California coastal zone. The City has a certified Local Coastal Program, which allows the City to issue Local Coastal Permits. The project contains many areas of wetlands and streams subject to the appeal jurisdiction of the Commission under Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 30603.

The proposed project is on the Dykstra Ranch site, located on a coastal terrace east of Highway 1 and north of State Route 92 at the eastern edge of the City of Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County, approximately one mile east of the Pacific Ocean. A mix of suburban development and vacant former agricultural lands lies between the site and Highway 1. Half Moon Bay High School is located on the southwest boundary of the site.

According to the project's Initial Study, the property has elevations ranging from about 245 feet in the southeast portion of the project area down to about 45 or 50 feet in the northwest corner. The western portion of the project area contains gentle slopes in the 5 percent range. Some ridges, particularly in the northeast, drop off steeply, approaching 28 percent in some cases. The land has been used for grazing cattle and has a history of barley cultivation.

Soils on the site consist of natural deposits of alluvium and artificial fill. The alluvial soils display slight to moderate erosion potential. Soils on the rolling hills in the northwestern part of the site also pose slight to moderate erosion potential. The upland soils on the hillslopes, along the northeastern boundary of the site are moderately to highly erodable. The site contains artificial fills for an earthen dam, embankment and drainage channel berms, relating to previous agricultural activities.

The site lies in the transition area between the foothills along the western flank of the Santa Cruz Mountains and the coastal plain in Half Moon Bay. The closest active earthquake faults are located approximately five miles northeast of the site. The general area is a seismically active region, and is subject to strong seismic ground shaking.

A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development) De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report

The project as approved by the City was to subdivide the 114-acre site into 197 residential lots (since revised to 145 lots), plus open space and access roads. The 197 lots would have averaged approximately 9,500 square feet in size and were proposed to be developed with two story houses ranging in size from 2,571 square feet to 3,547 square feet. Approximately 75 percent of the homes would have backed up onto open space consisting of a small lake (the converted former pond), creeks, seasonal wetlands and slopes of the eastern foothills. Many of the homes were positioned for views of the ocean. To increase the variation in design, approximately 58 percent of the houses were proposed to have detached garages.

Infrastructure associated with project construction includes privately maintained subdivision streets, plus underground lines for water, power, and sewer services. The project as originally proposed to the City included the creation of Foothill Boulevard both on and off the site and the extension of Grand View Boulevard. However the City's approval left this development unresolved, and specified only the temporary use of Terrace Avenue for project road access. The applicant has participated in a sewer assessment district with the Mid Coastside Sewer Authority in the amount necessary to assure sewer capacity for the subdivision. Approximately 5.15 acres of the site is to be dedicated to the City for park use. A homeowners association would maintain subdivision streets, sidewalks, streetlights, monument signs, wetlands, the pond, and open space amenities such as benches, bicycle racks, a tot lot and a gazebo.

Houses are projected to be priced above \$500,000, and to appeal to people purchasing their second or third home. These buyers are expected to be families with children of high school age or older.

As noted in Section 1.3 above, subsequent to the Commission's action on substantial issue, the applicant has revised the project for purposes of the de novo permit review. These revisions include reduction from 197 to 145 lots, relocation of a portion of the main "loop road" to avoid encroachment into the pond buffer area, and additional wetland and riparian corridor protections.

3.0 STANDARD OF REVIEW

Because the Commission found in March 2000 that the appeals filed regarding this project raise a substantial issue under the LCP, the Commission must consider the entire application *de novo* (PRC §§ 30603, 30621, and 30625; 14 CCR § 13115). The applicant has previously asserted that only those portions of the project that are located within 100 feet of a stream or wetland are within the Commission's physical appeal jurisdiction. However, the applicant confuses initial jurisdictional prerequisites with the Commission's authority to review the entire Pacific Ridge Development project de novo. Although Section 30603 lists the types of development for which the Commission has jurisdiction to hear an appeal, Section 30603 also indicates the parameters under which such review is to take place once jurisdiction is established. In accordance with Coastal Act Section 30603(a), the appeal is of the action taken by the local government approving the development. Likewise, Sections 30621 and 30625 of the Coastal Act provide that the application for the proposed development is before the Commission de novo. Therefore, consistent with Coastal Act Sections 30621 and 30625, the entire application approved by the City is before the Commission de novo.

Section 30604(b) states that after certification of a local coastal program, a coastal development permit shall be issued if the issuing agency or the Commission on appeal finds that the proposed

**A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development)
De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report**

development is in conformity with the certified local coastal program. Pursuant to Policy 1-1 of the City's certified LUP, the City has adopted the policies of the Coastal Act (sections 30210 through 30264) as the guiding policies of the LUP. Policy 1-4 of the City's LUP states that prior to issuance of any development permit, the [Commission] shall make the finding that the development meets the standards set forth in all applicable LUP policies. Thus, the LUP incorporates the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act. These policies are therefore included in the standard of review for the proposed project.

The project site is located within the Planned Development Area (PUD) designated in the City's Land Use Plan (LUP) as the Dykstra Ranch PUD. Section 9.3.7 of the LUP specifically addresses the development of the Dykstra Ranch PUD, and includes "Proposed Development Conditions" for the development. Section 18.37.020.C of the City's Zoning Code states in relevant part:

New development within Planned Development Areas shall be subject to development conditions as stated in the Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan for each Planned Development...

Therefore, Proposed Development Conditions (a) through (h) contained in LUP Section 9.3.7 are included in the standard of review for this proposed project and are hereinafter referred to as LUP Policies 9.3.7(a) through 9.3.7(h).

LUP Policy 9.3.7(a) requires a specific plan to be prepared for the entire [Dykstra Ranch Planned Development] area which incorporated all of the stated conditions and conforms to all other policies of the Land Use Plan. Accordingly, the City approved a specific plan for the Dykstra Ranch PUD on January 4, 1994, and subsequently incorporated this PUD plan as Chapter 18.16 of the Zoning Code – Dykstra Ranch PUD Zoning District. In accordance with the definitions provided in Zoning Code Section 18.02.040, the LCP uses the terms "Specific Plan" and "Planned Unit Development Plan" synonymously. Zoning Code Section 18.15.045.C states that a Planned Unit Development Plan shall expire two years after its effective date unless a building permit has been issued, construction diligently pursued, and substantial funds invested. Therefore, the Dykstra Ranch PUD Plan/Specific Plan expired two years after the Commission certified it (i.e., April 10, 1998). Because the specific plan has expired, Zoning Code Chapter 18.16 is not included in the standard of review for the appeal. A new specific plan has not been prepared for the development.

LUP Policy 9-8 states that areas designated in the LUP as PUD shall be planned as a unit and that preparation of specific plans may be required when parcels comprising a PUD are in separate ownerships. LUP Policy 9-14 states that where portions of a PUD are in separate ownership, approval may be granted for development of a parcel or group of parcels within the PUD provided that the City has approved a specific plan for the PUD district. In accordance with these policies, if the Dykstra Ranch PUD were comprised of properties in more than one ownership, a specific plan for the entire PUD would be required as a prerequisite to the development of any portion of the district. However, the Dykstra Ranch PUD District is comprised of three parcels that are all under a single ownership, and the Pacific Ridge Development represents a development plan for the entire PUD district. Therefore, pursuant to LUP Policies 9-8 and 9-14, a specific plan is not required as a prerequisite to the development of the Dykstra Ranch PUD. Although the specific plan required to be prepared under LUP Section

**A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development)
De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report**

9.3.7(a) has expired, the Commission could potentially find the development in conformance with the LCP, including the proposed development conditions for the PUD, without preparation of a new specific plan.

4.0 TRANSPORTATION

4.1 Regional Transportation Setting

The City of Half Moon Bay can only be accessed via Highway 1 from the north and south and by State Route 92 (SR 92) to the east (Exhibits 1, 2, and 3). Capacity increases to these roadways are constrained both legally and physically. Coastal Act Section 30254 states that it is the intent of the legislature that in rural areas, Highway 1 shall remain a scenic two-lane road. This Coastal Act policy is implemented through the San Mateo County LCP both to the north and to the south of the City, outside the City limits.

Highway 1 Corridor

Approximately 10 miles north of the City, in San Mateo County, Highway 1 passes through the “Devil’s Slide” area, where landslides cause frequent interruptions and occasional closures during the rainy season. Caltrans is currently seeking necessary approvals to construct a tunnel to by-pass Devil’s Slide. While the tunnel will improve operations of the highway in the section by preventing slide-related delays and closures, the width of the tunnel will only allow one lane in each direction consistent with Coastal Act Section 30254. Construction of additional lanes to provide additional capacity is therefore not an option in the Devil’s Slide area. (The Coastal Commission approved San Mateo County LCP Amendment 1-96 on January 9, 1997 providing for the tunnel alternative.)

The Highway 1 right-of-way provides sufficient width for a four-lane roadway throughout the City of Half Moon Bay. South of Miramontes Point Road, Highway 1 has a rural character with one lane and a graded shoulder in each direction. It varies in width between two and four lanes between Miramontes Point Road and Kelly Avenue. North of Kelly Avenue, it includes two lanes in each direction separated by a raised median before returning to one lane in each direction north of North Main Street. The intersections of Highway 1 with North Main Street, SR 92, and Kelly Avenue are controlled with traffic signals. The intersections of Highway 1 with minor roadways are controlled with stop signs on the minor street approaches. These intersections include Seymour Street, Main Street-Higgins Purissima Road, Wavecrest Road, Bernardo Avenue, Dolores Avenue, and Redondo Beach Road.

The roadway widens at unsignalized intersections to accommodate a 12-foot left turn lane. The capacity of the corridor (LOS E)¹ is approximately 2,500 vehicles per hour. Any volume greater than 2,500 vehicles per hour would be considered an undesirable level of service F. Currently, the corridor carries approximately 3,120 vehicles during the weekday PM peak-hour and 3,000

¹ Traffic analysis is commonly undertaken using the level of service rating method. The level of service rating is a qualitative description of the operational conditions along roadways and within intersections. Level of service is reported using an A through F letter system to describe travel delay and congestion. Level of service (LOS) A indicates free-flowing conditions. LOS E indicates the maximum capacity condition with significant congestion and delays. An LOS F rating indicates an intersection that exceeds operational capacity with unacceptable delays and congestion.

A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development) De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report

vehicles during the Saturday midday peak-hour. Thus, the corridor operates at LOS F (*Rees 2000*). In addition, the unsignalized Terrace Avenue/Highway 1 intersection currently operates at LOS F due to heavy traffic on Highway 1 that constrains turning movements of vehicles attempting to enter Highway 1 from Terrace Avenue (*Dowling 1998*).

The City is currently preparing a Project Study Report for submittal to Caltrans to study an approximately \$3 million improvement plan for the Highway 1 corridor north of North Main Street. The improvements contemplated include widening the remaining two-lane sections to four lanes, consolidating intersections, and improving bicycle and pedestrian safety. Under this plan, Bayview Drive might serve as the consolidated, signalized intersection at Highway 1. The other intersections north of North Main would remain unsignalized and restricted to right turning traffic. These improvements would result in operational improvements to LOS C for the corridor (*Fehr & Peers 2000*). This project is currently in the planning stage, and the environmental review process has not yet been initiated. The City hopes to complete these improvements in 2005.

Highway 92 Corridor

SR 92 runs east of the City to Highway 280 traversing steep rugged terrain. Because of the steep slopes, slow-moving vehicles delay eastbound traffic. Currently, the SR 92 corridor carries approximately 1,976 vehicles during the weekday PM peak-hour and 1,800 vehicles during the Saturday midday peak-hour. Given the characteristics of this roadway, including its steep slopes and curves, this traffic volume results in levels of service F during the weekday peak and nearly F during the weekend peak.

In 1989, the voters of San Mateo County passed Measure A, a 1/2 cent sales tax initiative to provide funds for transportation improvements within the county.² Operational and safety improvements to SR 92 from Highway 1 to SR 280 were included as part of the Measure A Program. Improvements were subsequently divided into four separate construction packages. The first segment to go into construction, the section of Highway 1 from Pilarcitos Creek south of the City to Skyline Boulevard (SR 35) is scheduled for completion in the summer of 2000. The other three segments, including SR 92 improvements, are currently in the preliminary engineering and environmental documentation phase, with construction scheduled to begin in 2001.

In Phase 1, the City plans to widen the segment of SR 92 from Main Street to approximately 1,900 feet east of Main Street to four lanes. This stretch of four lanes will provide additional capacity for vehicles that is needed within the city limits to facilitate traffic movements at the signalized intersections. This is consistent with the Circulation Element of the City's LCP. This widening project, as further described below, is expected to bring the SR 92 corridor within the City limits to an acceptable level of service under the LCP (LOS C or better).

The City has recently circulated an Initial Study/Environmental Assessment for both Phases 1 and 2 of the proposed SR 92 widening project (*Caltrans 2000*). This project includes widening from two to four lanes, intersection improvements, and improved bicycle and pedestrian safety (Exhibits 4-7). The City is the lead agency for Phase 1 of this project and will enter into a

² Unrelated to the City of Half Moon Bay Residential Growth Initiative also known as Measure A.

A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development)

De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report

cooperative agreement with Caltrans for final design and construction for this part. In 1998, the City entered into an agreement with the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) for additional funding for the Phase 1 portion of the project. Funding for Phase 1 includes \$3.97 million from the State, \$4.92 million from SCMTA and \$0.82 million from the City. The City expects to complete Phase 1 by 2002

Phase 1 starts at Highway 1 and continues east along SR 92 to approximately 2,230 feet east of Main Street. The Phase 1 improvements include (see Exhibits 4-7):

- Shift median island easterly on Highway 1 to provide an additional left turn lane from southbound Highway 1 to eastbound SR 92, traffic signal modifications;
- Widen SR 92 from Highway 1 to Main Street to provide two through lanes and a right turn only lane in the easterly direction and a left turn pocket at the SR 92/Main Street intersection;
- Widen SR 92 from Highway 1 to Main Street to provide two through lanes in the westerly direction with added right and left turn lanes at the SR 92/Highway 1 intersection;
- Construct a raised landscaped median and new curb and sidewalk on both sides of SR 92;
- Introduce new street trees and decorative lighting along SR 92, between Highway 1 and Main Street;
- Improve SR 92/Main Street intersection by replacing the pavement, traffic signal modifications, new curb and sidewalks;
- Modify the existing drainage system between Highway 1 and Main Street as needed;
- Widen SR 92 from Main Street to approximately 2,230 feet east of Main Street to provide two lanes in each direction, a raised landscaped median with opening for left turns into Hilltop Mobile Home Park, a right turn only lane from westbound SR 92 to northbound North Main Street, with bike lanes, curbs, sidewalks, decorative lighting, and street trees;
- Widen Main Street on the east side from SR 92 south to Stone Pine Road to provide a right turn only lane, with new curb, sidewalk and decorative lighting;
- Widen North Main Street between SR 92 and Highway 1 approximately 3 feet on each side to provide a bike lane in each direction, replace existing pavement, with new curb, sidewalk, decorative lighting and street trees;
- Construct a retaining wall at the southeast corner of Highway 1/SR 92 intersection and construct a retaining wall approximately 580 m (1,900 feet) east of Main Street, on the north side of SR 92; and
- Relocate existing overhead utilities underground where practical.

Phase 2 follows SR 92 from approximately 2,230 feet east of Main Street to the city limit line and will be constructed by the SCMTA. Phase 2 will include widening SR 92 from approximately 2,230 feet east of Main Street to the city limit line to provide one standard 12-foot lane and an 8-foot outside shoulder in each direction.

To the east of the City within the County portion of the SR 92 corridor, an uphill passing lane is currently under construction to improve flow. In addition, the SCMTA is preparing plans for a

A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development) De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report

widening and curve correction project from Pilarcitos Creek to the proposed Foothill Boulevard. This project will include widening of existing lanes and curve corrections to improve safety, but terrain and proximity to stream corridors prohibit widening the roadway to provide additional lanes east of the City limits. Thus, while the proposed lane widening and curve corrections will improve the flow of traffic through this corridor, it is not feasible to increase capacity by adding lanes to this section of SR 92.

4.2 LCP Standards

The City of Half Moon Bay LCP contains policies requiring adequate road capacity to serve new development and impacts of development to traffic on Highways 1 and 92. LUP Policy 9-2 specifies that development shall not be permitted unless it is found that the development will be served upon completion with road facilities. LUP Policy 9-4 states that (1) all new development shall be accessed from a public street or have access over private streets to a public street, (2) development shall be served with adequate services and that lack of adequate services shall be grounds for denial of a development permit or reduction in the density otherwise allowed under the LUP, and (3) that the applicant shall assume full responsibility for the costs for service extensions or such share as shall be provided through an improvement or assessment district for required service extensions. LUP Policy 10-31 requires developers of property along the Foothill Boulevard alignment to participate in an assessment district to provide funding necessary to construct this roadway and provides design criteria for this roadway.

Section 9.3.7 of the LUP includes Proposed Development Conditions for the development of the Dykstra Ranch Planned Unit Development Area (the project site). Proposed Development Condition 9.3.7(a) provides for the reduction of the maximum allowable density of 228 units for the project site if the remaining capacity on SR 92 is inadequate to accommodate that level of development. Condition 9.3.7(f) requires construction of the portion of Foothill Boulevard located within the PUD area as a part of the development. LUP Policy 10-25 designates LOS C as the desired level of service on Highways 1 and 92 except during the weekday and weekend peak-hours when LOS E may be accepted. In addition, pursuant to LUP Policy 1-1, the City has adopted the policies of the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act as the guiding policies of the LUP. Accordingly, the City's LUP adopts Coastal Act Sections 30250 and 30252, which also require that development only be approved in areas with adequate public services.

4.3 Traffic and Circulation Impacts

The roadway connections, both existing and proposed, to the project site are shown on Exhibit 2 and 3. Regional highway connections to Half Moon Bay are shown on Exhibit 1 and 4. The project site is located approximately 3,300 feet north of SR 92 and approximately 2,000 feet inland of Highway 1, and is separated from these highways by both developed and undeveloped areas. Terrace Avenue, which currently serves the Grandview Terrace neighborhood with a connection to Highway 1 to the west, is the only existing road connection to the project site. The LUP Map shows proposed future access to the site via Foothill Boulevard, which would run north from SR 92 linking with the project site and with existing roadways.

The applicant proposes to provide both construction and post-construction access to the site via extension of Terrace Avenue, connecting the project site to Highway 1 to the west. The project was initially designed with the primary site access via Foothill Boulevard. The LCP encourages

A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development) De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report

the development of Foothill Boulevard, as an alternative throughway for local traffic parallel to Highway 1. However, the environmental review process undertaken for the City's approval revealed that the proposed alignment of Foothill Boulevard would encroach into wetlands. The City of Half Moon Bay LCP prohibits construction of roads within 100 feet of a wetland. Subsequently, the applicant modified the project to only include the portion of Foothill Boulevard located within the boundaries of the project site. The project will not therefore complete the link of Foothill to SR 92 as shown on the LUP map. It is unresolved whether an alternative alignment for Foothill Boulevard exists that would avoid wetlands.

The applicant proposes to use Bayview Drive if constructed as a preferred access to the development from Highway 1. Bayview Drive would connect the Pacific Ridge site to Highway 1 to the north of Terrace Avenue through the Beachwood property. However, the City recently denied a coastal development permit application for development of the Beachwood Subdivision located between the project site and Highway 1. The Beachwood project included the construction of Bayview Drive. The owners of the Beachwood property have no incentive to pursue construction of Bayview Drive in the absence of an approval for the subdivision. It is unknown whether the City would pursue construction of Bayview by exercising eminent domain.

Construction Impacts

Construction-related traffic has the potential to adversely affect local traffic circulation on Terrace Avenue and at the intersection of Terrace and Highway 1. Construction traffic will generate an average of 46-50 trips per day over an approximately 300-day construction period through the unsignalized Terrace Avenue/Highway 1 intersection (*Rees 2000*).³ This construction traffic represents a 1.6-percent increase over the current peak-hour traffic within the Highway 1 corridor north of North Main Street.

Post-Construction Impacts

Assessment of the post-construction traffic impacts of the proposed development is based on estimated vehicle trip rates for a 150-unit development. The development will generate 152 new trips during the PM peak-hour and 142 new trips during the Saturday noon peak-hour (*Fehr & Peers 2000*). These new trips represent an approximately 4.7-percent increase of traffic within the Highway 1 corridor north of North Main Street.

4.4 Mitigation Proposed by the Applicant

The unsignalized Terrace Avenue/Highway 1 intersection currently operates at LOS F. Construction traffic impacts will be mitigated, as further described below, by avoiding peak-hour periods and by providing traffic controls when necessary. The applicant proposes to mitigate post-construction traffic impacts at the Terrace Avenue intersection through the installation of a traffic signal and by widening the remaining two-lane section of Highway 1 between North Main Street and 400 feet north of Terrace Avenue to four lanes prior to occupancy of the residences. These measures will improve the operation of the intersection from the current LOS F to LOS A, and of this section of the Highway 1 corridor from LOS F to LOS C (*Rees 2000*). Thus, as

³ Vehicle trip rates for the project traffic analysis are based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers publication *Trip Generation 5th Edition*. This publication is accepted by the City of Half Moon Bay and most municipalities in the U.S. for calculating vehicle trip generation.

A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development)

De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report

proposed, the project will avoid short-term construction impacts to the operation of the Terrace Avenue intersection, will improve the long-term operation of the intersection, and will contribute toward the needed improvements for the Highway 1 corridor within the City.

The applicant proposes to minimize the impacts of construction traffic to local traffic circulation through the following measures:

- Construction equipment and worker vehicles will be staged and parked on the project site.
- The applicant will notify the City 24 hours in advance if more than 25 worker vehicles are to exit the site during the PM peak-hour, and reimburse the City for the cost of any resulting traffic controls at the intersection of Terrace Avenue and Highway 1.
- The applicant will maintain Terrace Avenue free of dirt and debris throughout project construction.
- Heavy construction vehicles will access the site during non-peak hours.
- The applicant will install speed bumps on Terrace Avenue.

The applicants propose to mitigate the post-construction traffic impacts by providing the following improvements prior to occupancy of the proposed residences:

- installation of a traffic light at the Terrace Avenue/Highway 1 intersection,
- widening the remaining 2-lane section of Highway 1 to four lanes between North Main Street to 400 feet north of Terrace with a southbound left turn lane from the highway onto Terrace, and
- upon completion of alternative site access via Bayview and/or Foothill, the removal of the traffic signal at Terrace Avenue and conversion of Terrace to an emergency vehicle only access with knockdown barriers at the entrance to the project site.

These improvements have not been authorized but represent about one third of the City's \$3 million Highway 1 improvement plan for the corridor north of North Main Street described in Section 4.1 above.

The following issues are of particular concern in the Commission's review of this project:

1. approvability of a proposed subdivision where the existing level of service on either Highway 1 or SR 92 within the City during the weekday and weekend peak-hours is LOS F,
2. and approvability of a proposed subdivision where the mitigation for traffic impacts would provide only a some, but not all, of the improvements needed to bring the operation of these highway corridors to the levels of service required by the LCP.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE HABITAT AREAS

5.1 LCP Standards

Chapter 3 of the City of Half Moon Bay LCP includes standards to minimize the impacts of development to environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA) including wetlands, riparian corridors, and areas that support rare, endangered and unique plant and animal species. The applicable policies include LUP Policies 3-1, 3-3, 3-4, 3-5, 3-9, 3-11, 3-12, LUP Appendix A,

A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development) De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report

and LCP Zoning Code Sections 18.02.040, 18.38.020, 18.38.035, 18.38.055, 18.38.075 and 18.38.080. These LCP standards define sensitive habitats and their buffer areas, the uses that are permitted within or near these areas, the analysis that must be undertaken to identify them, and the development standards that must be applied to protect them. In addition, pursuant to Policy 1-1 of the City's certified LUP, the City has adopted the policies (Sections 30210 through 30264) as the guiding policies of the LUP. Accordingly, the City's LUP adopts Coastal Act Sections 30233 and 30240, which limit development within and adjacent to ESHAs, including wetlands.

5.2 Wetlands

In its action on the substantial issue portion of this appeal in March 2000, the Commission found that a substantial issue existed regarding whether the project plans approved by the City included all of the wetland areas on the site. Subsequent to the City's approval, the applicant has submitted a series of reports and memoranda culminating in a revised wetlands delineation dated November 4, 1999 (Exhibit 8). The revised wetlands delineation shows eight vegetated wet areas, three ephemeral and two intermittent streams and a pond. The Commission's staff biologist has determined that the revised delineation accurately depicts the wetland areas on the site in accordance with the LCP. Staff notes that the provisions regarding wetlands contained in the certified LCP, including Section 30233 of the Coastal Act, which the City adopted in its certified LCP, require the protection of all areas within the project site where the water table is near the land surface long enough to support the growth of hydrophytes or to support the formation of hydric soils.

Numerous gullies are located in the area. The site's vegetation has been affected by historic cultivation. Mature eucalyptus and cypress trees exist on portions of the site. The pond and streams contain willows, cypress and other plants associated with wetlands. The 1.6-acre pond shown in the revised wetlands delineation was created in the 1950s as a stock pond. This was accomplished through construction of a 23-foot-high earthen dam on the west side of the pond and diversion of a stream (Stream 3). Stream 4 also drains into the pond and surrounding wetlands. The pond outflows into Stream 5, which eventually leads to Pilarcitos Creek. The pond and a 100-foot buffer around it are shown on the project plans. Although the project plans include a 100-foot buffer around the pond, the applicant asserts that no buffer is required under the LCP because it is a man-made pond used for agricultural purposes (*Cassidy 10/28/99*). While disagreeing with the staff's position with respect to required buffers for the pond and Wetlands A, E, and G, the applicant has amended the permit application de novo to include a 100-foot buffer around each of these areas.

LUP Policy 3-11(c) states:

Along lakes, ponds, and other wet areas, extend buffer zones 100 feet from the high water point, except for man-made ponds and reservoirs used for agricultural purposes for which no buffer zone is designated. [Emphasis added]

This policy is implemented by Zoning Code Section 18.38.080.D, which defines "Wetlands Buffer Zone" as:

The minimum buffer surrounding lakes, ponds, and marshes shall be 100 feet, measured from the high water point, except that no buffer is required for man-made ponds and reservoirs used for agriculture. [Emphasis added]

A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development)
De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report

The applicant states that the pond will be used for agricultural purposes because water from the pond is proposed to be used to irrigate a community garden.

Chapter 8 of the LUP incorporates the definition of “Agricultural Use” contained in Government Code Section 51201(b) which states:

“Agricultural use” means use of land for the purpose of producing an agricultural commodity for commercial purposes.

The proposed community garden is not a use of land for the purpose of producing an agricultural commodity for commercial purposes and is not therefore an agricultural use under the LCP. Although the pond was originally created for agricultural purposes, the proposed development will not continue this or any other agricultural use on the site. Consequently, a 100-foot buffer is required around the pond in accordance with LUP Policy 3-11(c) and Zoning Code Section 18.38.080.D.

The applicants also contend that Wetlands A, E and G are exempt from the Commission’s review authority under §13577(b)(2) of the Commission’s regulation. Section 13577(b)(2) provides that wetlands subject to the Commission’s appeal jurisdiction do not include:

“... wetland habitat created by the presence of and associated with agricultural ponds and reservoirs where the pond or reservoir was in fact constructed by a farmer or rancher for agricultural purposes; and there is no evidence [...] showing that wetland habitat predated the existence of the pond or reservoir. Areas with drained hydric soils that are no longer capable of supporting hydrophytes shall not be considered wetlands.”
[Emphasis added]

In support of their contention, the applicants assert that Wetlands A, E and G are exempt because they were created to supply water to the pond and reservoir (Wetland E) or as a result of runoff and seepage from the pond and reservoir (Wetlands A and G). However, as discussed above, the record documents that the pond will no longer be used for agricultural purposes. Since the site no longer contains an agricultural pond, the other wetlands are no longer associated with or created by an agricultural pond. It is staff’s position that the exemption provided in Section 13577(b)(2) does not apply to wetlands that currently exist independent of and disassociated from preexisting agricultural activities. The staff also notes that if the wetlands were filled, they would support residential, not agricultural activities. It is also staff’s position that the exemption in § 13577(b)(2) is inapplicable to the proposed fill of wetlands for other than agricultural purposes.

While stating that he reserves the right to amend the project with respect to protection of the pond, the applicant reduced the number of proposed lots and reconfigured the subdivision plan to conform with the wetland buffer policies of the LCP. As modified, no portion of any lot line is proposed within 100 feet of the delineated wetlands, including the pond.

The project plans also provide for the construction of a public trail within the 100-foot buffer zone surrounding the pond and wetlands C, D, and E (Exhibit 9). While the LCP allows trails within wetland buffer areas, LUP Policy 3-3(b) specifies that development adjacent to sensitive habitats shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts that could significantly degrade the habitat. The placement of a trail within the wetland buffer increases the likelihood that the habitat may be disturbed by dogs entering the wetlands. The presence of dogs could be particularly harmful in the pond area where they would likely harass birds and small mammals

A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development) De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report

using this habitat. The applicant proposes to minimize this potential impact by constructing a 3-foot-high chain link fence between the pathway and the wetland areas, and by planting native coastal scrub species along the fence line. These measures are appropriate to ensure that the proposed trail will be sited and designed in a manner that will not significantly degrade the adjacent sensitive habitat.

In addition to the fencing, the applicant proposes other measures designed to protect and enhance the wetland areas on the site, including:

- installation of a slotted weir at the outlet of the pond to assure that a minimum water level is maintained in the pond,
- planting of coastal scrub species and willows in the upland areas surrounding the pond,
- bullfrog eradication (as further discussed in Section 5.4 below),
- implementation of the storm water and water quality management measures,
- modifications to Stream 3 to divert more water into Wetland E and the pond, and
- installation of temporary construction fencing to prevent construction equipment from unintentionally entering wetland and wetland buffer areas.

The applicant proposes to prepare a Final Habitat Enhancement and Management Plan that will provide for monitoring to determine the success of the proposed habitat enhancement measures and for the long-term management and preservation of these habitat areas. To ensure that the development will conform to the wetland protection policies of the LCP, any approval must require the applicant to submit the Final Habitat Enhancement and Management Plan to the executive director for review and approval in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game prior to issuance of a coastal development permit.

The project as proposed also includes installation of an overflow storm drain intake in the southwest corner of the pond. This drain would also provide for periodic draining of the pond as necessary for bullfrog eradication as discussed in Section 5.4 below.

5.3 Riparian Corridors

The property contains five streams, two are ephemeral, or seasonal, and three are intermittent or storm water drainages. These streams are indicated on Exhibit 9 as Streams 1-5. The proposed development plan shows the location of these five riparian corridors and the development setbacks required under the LCP. Specifically, Zoning Code Section 18.38.075.D sets the riparian buffer zone for intermittent streams as 30 feet outward from the limit of riparian vegetation or 30 feet from the midpoint of intermittent streams where no riparian vegetation exists. Some portions of these stream corridors are beneath a eucalyptus canopy. Consequently, these areas are without riparian vegetation and the setback is defined as 30 feet from the midpoint of the stream. In the areas that are not covered by eucalyptus, willows and other riparian vegetation are established. In these areas, the riparian buffer is shown as 30 feet from the limit of the riparian vegetation. The applicant's biologist identified a sixth stream in the area of the eucalyptus grove that feeds into Wetland B along the northern boundary of the site (*Foreman*

A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development)
De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report

1999). However, this riparian area (Stream 6) and the corresponding development setback are not shown on the project plans.

In conformance with the LCP policies concerning protection of riparian areas, no lots are proposed within any of the streams or buffers shown on the revised wetland delineation. A total of seven road crossings are proposed via arched culverts with one culvert across Streams 1, 2, 4, and 5 and three across Stream 3. These crossings are shown on Exhibit 9 as Bridges 1-7. Such bridges are permitted within riparian corridors in accordance with Zoning Code Section 18.38.075.B.1 only if no feasible or practical alternative exists and when bridge supports are not in significant conflict with corridor resources.

As discussed in Section 4.0 above, the applicant is required under the LCP to construct the portion of Foothill Boulevard located within the project site. Beginning at the southern boundary of the site and running north to Grandview, this section of Foothill Boulevard crosses Streams 1, 2, and 3. Because Streams 1, 2, and 3 run perpendicular through the alignment of Foothill Boulevard as designated on the LUP Access and Circulation Map, it is not feasible to construct Foothill Boulevard without crossing these streams. In addition, the proposed bridges would span the streams with no supports located within the riparian corridor. Therefore, there are no feasible alternatives to proposed Bridges 1 and 2 and these stream crossings are not in significant conflict with corridor resources. However, because Foothill Boulevard will not extend south of the site to State Route 92 at this time, the applicant does not propose to construct the section of Foothill that would cross Stream 1 (shown as Bridge 8 on Exhibit 9). It is not known if and when Bridge 8 will be constructed.

Bridges 3, 4, and 5 allow the main internal roadway system for the development to form a complete loop. However, it would be feasible to eliminate one of these bridges and still provide access to all of the proposed lots. If, for example, Bridge 4 were eliminated, the lots on either side of Stream 4 could still be reached. However, the applicant has asserted that the City of Half Moon Bay Fire Code prohibits dead end roads of this length. Staff has not found a specific provision of the Fire Code supporting this assertion. Thus, it is unclear at this time whether there are feasible or practical alternatives to Bridges 3, 4, or 5. Since bridges 3, 4, and 5 would span the streams with no supports located within the riparian corridors, they would not be in significant conflict with corridor resources.

Bridge 6 would create a third crossing of Stream 3. The applicant has not demonstrated that there is no feasible or practical alternative to this stream crossing. Because the length of the roads on either side of Bridge 6 are much shorter than the main loop road discussed above, it appears that Bridge 6 could be eliminated without any other modifications to the internal road system consistent with the fire code and the proposed plot plan. Therefore, staff's preliminary analysis indicates that the LCP requires Bridge 6 to be eliminated from the development.

As proposed, Bridge 7 is required to provide access to four lots, number 4-7, at the southern boundary of the development, as the only proposed crossing of Stream 1 at this time. Lots 4 and 5 both front Foothill and could potentially be accessed via this route as an alternative to Bridge 7. However, in accordance with LUP Policy 9.3.7(f), no curb cuts are permitted for driveway access to Foothill Boulevard. Therefore, Bridge 7 is the only feasible or practical alternative to provide access to lots 4-7.

A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development)
De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report

Stream 3 was diverted in the 1950s to create the pond. Currently, this stream flows partially into Wetland E and the pond with the remaining flow draining into a major storm drain system to the west of the development site on the Beachwood property. The applicant proposes to construct a channel to divert most of the normal flow of Stream 3 into Wetland E and the pond with only high water flows continuing west into the storm drain system. Directing the primary flow of Stream 3 into the wetland area will help maintain the water level in the pond necessary to support San Francisco garter snakes and California red legged-frogs as further discussed in Section 5.4 below. The proposed diversion may therefore be characterized as a fish and wildlife management activity. Zoning Code Section 18.38.075.B.1. allows such activities to be undertaken in riparian corridors.

The applicant also proposes to install a drain in the southwest corner of the pond directing water from the pond during high-flow conditions into the storm drain system. By diverting water from Stream 3 into the pond and then diverting high flows from the pond into the storm drain, the proposed development may allow even high flows to by-pass the portion of Stream 3 below the diversion. To protect against this potential de-watering of Stream 3, staff analysis indicates that the high-water drain proposed to be installed in the pond should direct water from the pond into the original bed of Stream 3 immediately downstream of the proposed diversion.

As noted above, the Stream 6 along the northern boundary of the site and appropriate setbacks are not indicated on the project plans. Thus, the staff cannot conclude that the proposed lot lines adjacent to this riparian corridor will not encroach into either the stream or buffer area. Because this drainage is located within a eucalyptus grove and is therefore without riparian vegetation, the required development setback is 30 feet from the midpoint of the stream. Staff analysis indicates that this issue might be addressed by requiring the applicant to prepare a Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map depicting all of the riparian corridors and buffers, including Drainage 6.

Zoning Ordinance 18.28.035(B)(1) requires coastal development permit applicants to map all sensitive coastal resource areas within 200 feet of the project site. This information is necessary to determine if a proposed development may affect offsite sensitive resources. The Pacific Ridge Development plans do not map the extension of Stream 3 to the west of the site. As a result, the Commission cannot determine whether the proposed extension of Terrace Avenue may encroach within this riparian corridor or its buffer. Because this portion of Stream 3 is within the eucalyptus canopy and is therefore without riparian vegetation, the required setback for the road extension under the LCP is 30 feet from the center of the corridor. Thus, in accordance with the LCP, the proposed Terrace Avenue extension may not be constructed within 30 feet of the centerline of any portion, on or offsite, of the Stream 3 riparian corridor.

5.4 Threatened and Endangered Species

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has determined through a formal consultation to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers that the pond and surrounding area provide important habitat area for the threatened California red legged-frog and the endangered San Francisco garter snake (*White 1998*). The consultation includes a recommendation that no development occur be permitted within 150 feet of the pond – 50 feet greater than the buffer proposed by the applicant. It appears from the project plans that portions of at least two proposed lots and of the road on the northern side of the site are located within this 150-foot buffer.

A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development) De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report

The LCP contains several policies pertinent to protection of these species and their habitat, including both general ESHA policies and specific policies for both the California red legged-frog and the San Francisco garter snake. The Commission staff has not completed its review of this issue.

6.0 CONVERSION OF AGRICULTURAL LANDS

In the past, the lower slopes and flatlands within the 114-acre Pacific Ridge site were used for pasture. Approximately 36 acres of the site (32 percent) contain Class II soils as shown on the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soils Conservation Service Soil Survey (*USDA 1961*) and are therefore classified as prime agricultural lands under the LCP (Exhibit 10). The proposed project would commit these prime agricultural lands to urban use.

6.1 LCP Standards

The LCP incorporates Coastal Act Sections 30241 and 30242, which provide that the maximum amount of prime agricultural land shall be maintained in agricultural production and that conversion to nonagricultural uses of other non-prime lands shall be limited. Conformance with these policies is to be accomplished through, among other means, the establishment of stable urban/rural boundaries and by limiting conversion of agricultural lands where the viability of agricultural uses is severely limited by conflicts with urban uses.

The LUP adopts the Coastal Act definition of prime agricultural lands, which incorporates by reference Government Code Section 51201. This definition includes all land which qualifies for rating as Class I or Class II in the Soils Conservation Service land use capability classifications.

LUP Policy 8-12 sets the urban/rural boundary for the region as the Half Moon Bay City Limit.

Coastal Act Section 30250(a), also incorporated into the LCP, requires that new development shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to existing developed areas.

6.2 Discussion

Chapter 8 of the LUP provides for the urbanization of former agricultural lands where farming is no longer economically viable. The land use designations and agricultural policies of the LUP establish a system for phasing the conversion of agricultural lands to urban use. The criteria used to form this phasing plan include, availability of necessary infrastructure, proximity to existing developed areas, and parcel size. Lands clearly no longer suitable for agriculture are designated for development first. Lands that are expected in the short term to be suitable for agricultural use are designated as Urban Reserve. These lands are to be developed only after substantial build-out of the lands designated for development. The LUP designates lands capable of continuing to support viable agricultural uses (at the time that the LUP was certified in 1985) as Open Space Reserve. Open Space Reserve lands may be developed under the LUP only after all other remaining lands in the City suitable for development have been developed or committed to other uses. Chapter 9 of the LUP further provides that new development shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to existing developed areas to (1) avoid urban sprawl, (2) prevent premature commitment of rural lands to development, and (3) preserve the maximum amount of land in urban areas suitable for agricultural use.

A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development) De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report

All undeveloped lands designated in the LUP as potentially suitable for new residential development are classified into six categories in accordance with their relationship to existing development, prior commitment to urbanization, and the coastal resource protection policies of the Coastal Act. These categories are intended to prioritize development within the City as follows:

1. Existing Neighborhoods. In-fill development of existing neighborhoods.
2. Paper Subdivisions. Undeveloped areas previously committed to urbanization by subdivision.
3. Contiguous Unsubdivided Lands Without Significant Resource Value. Unsubdivided lands generally contiguous with or surrounded by existing development without significant agricultural, habitat, or coastal recreational value.
4. Unsubdivided And Other Lands Not Contiguous With Existing Development Without Significant Resource or Recreational Value. The Wavecrest Restoration Project is the only area in the City that falls within this category.
5. Unsubdivided Lands Contiguous with Existing Development and Having Agricultural, Coastal Recreation or Habitat Value.
6. Unsubdivided Lands not Contiguous with Existing Development and Having Agricultural, Coastal Recreation, Habitat, and Scenic Value.

The LUP designates the Pacific Ridge Development site as a Category 3 area suitable for development.

The project site contains only a small amount of prime soils, is not currently in agricultural production, and is not considered a viable agricultural site under the LUP. The site is located within the urban rural boundary and is contiguous with the existing Grandview Terrace and Newport Terrace subdivisions. Agricultural use of the site is severely limited by conflicts with urban uses. For example, pesticide use would be restricted due to proximity to residential development and to the high school. For all of these reasons, the project site is designated in the LUP as an area suitable for development.

7.0 VISUAL RESOURCES

Because the project site is located at the base of hills inland of Highway 1, the development will not affect views of the coast. However, the development could significantly alter views of the hillsides. The LCP includes policies intended to protect such inland views of these scenic hillsides. Included in these policies is Zoning Code Section 18.37.020.B, which designates the hillside areas above the 160-foot contour east of the project site as a scenic area. These hillsides are included on the Visual Resources Overlay Map of the LUP. LUP Policy 9.3.7(c) states:

No development shall be permitted on slopes in excess of 25% or above the 160' contour and, as a condition of approval, an open space easement shall be dedicated which ensures the permanent retention of such slopes in open space. Development shall be clustered to the maximum extent feasible on lower slopes. [Emphasis added]

As proposed, no portion of any building footprint would be located above the 160-foot contour line, but portions of the homes to be constructed on the upper lots would project above this elevation. In their appeal, the appellants contended that the LCP prohibits any portion of a

A-1-HMB-99-022 (Pacific Ridge Development)
De Novo Review – Issues Summary Report

structure to project above this elevation. However, LUP Policy 9.3.7(c) specifies that no development shall be permitted on slopes above the 160-foot contour. Given the policies' limitation on development on slopes above the 160-foot contour, it appears that no portion of any structure may be constructed on slopes above the 160-foot contour. That a portion of a structure projects above this elevation does not violate the prohibition that development not be permitted on slopes above the 160-foot contour.

Staff's preliminary analysis indicates that the proposed residential structures are consistent with the 160-foot contour restriction.

However, because, the proposed project includes development, i.e., the creation of a few lots on slopes in excess of 25 percent, the project still raises issues of consistency with LUP Policy 9.3.7(c). The Commission staff has not completed its analysis of this issue.

8.0 WATER QUALITY/POLLUTED RUNOFF

The proposed development may adversely affect coastal water quality both on and off site through increased runoff from new impervious surfaces, sedimentation resulting from grading and vegetation removal, and use of herbicides, pesticides and other hazardous substance. Polluted runoff and sedimentation could significantly impact the viability of the threatened and endangered species habitat discussed in Section 5.4 above. The applicant proposes to avoid such impacts by implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and a Pond Water Quality Management Plan. The applicant also proposes to label all storm drain inlets, grading each lot to direct drainage to the storm drain system and not over adjacent lots or slopes, construct swales for water detention and filtration, and ensure a 0.5 percent minimum street grade along the face of the curb.

The staff has not completed its review to determine whether these proposed measures are sufficient to prevent impacts to coastal water quality.

APPENDIX A

Substantive File Documents

- Caltrans 2000. "Initial Study/Environmental Assessment – State Route 92 Widening Project, Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County, California," State Clearinghouse Number 2000032103, March 22, 2000.
- CCS 1998. "Supplemental Traffic Study, Foothill Boulevard Access Alternatives," CCS Planning & Engineering, December 1998.
- Dowling 1998. "Highway 92 Traffic Assessment," Dowling Associates, June 22, 1998.
- Fehr & Peers 2000. "Transportation Issues – Pacific Ridge Development Project," Fehr & Peers Associates, Inc., January 12, 2000.
- Foreman, Steve 1999. "Letter to Bob Henry – California Coastal Commission Questions," LSA Associates, Inc., December 21, 1999.
- Half Moon Bay 1998. "Final Environmental Impact Report for Dykstra Ranch," Western Ecological Services Company, Inc., December 1988.
- HLA 1990. "San Francisco Garter Snake Survey and Riparian Mitigation Plan; Beachwood Subdivision, Half Moon Bay," Harding Lawson Associates, April 21, 1990.
- LSA 1999. "Biological Resource Report, Pacific Ridge at Half Moon Bay, LSA Associates, Inc.," June 15, 1999.
- Rees, Rob 2000. "Pacific Ridge Development – Response to Coastal Commission Questions," Fehr & Peers Associates, Inc., March 23, 2000.
- RMI 1997. "Pacific Ridge at Half Moon Bay Wetland Mitigation and Monitoring Plan," Resource Management International, Inc., December 1997
- San Mateo County Countywide Transportation Plan, City/County Association of Governments, San Mateo County (C/CAG), June 1997.
- White 1998. "Formal Consultation on the Proposed Pacific Ridge Development Project, Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County, California (PCN 23053 S)," Wayne S. White, U.S. Department of Interior Fish and Wildlife Service November 16, 1998.